

REMARKS

Claims 1-16 are currently pending in the application, of which claims 1, 8, 9, and 16 are independent. In the Office Action dated May 4, 2007, the Examiner rejected all pending claims under 35 U.S.C. §102(e) as being anticipated by U.S. Patent No. 7,000,187 ("*Messinger*"). Applicants respectfully traverse the Examiner's rejections.

Specifically, Applicants' independent claim 1 recites, among other things, "receiving a command from a user to display the first work pane and the second work pane simultaneously; and displaying the first work pane and the second work pane in the window." In rejecting claim 1, the Examiner contended that screens 40b and 40c in *Messinger's* FIGS. 9 and 10 depict displaying the first and second work pane simultaneously in a window as recited. Contrary to the Examiner's contention, Applicants submit that screens 40b and 40c correspond, respectively, to sequential steps associated with a task (e.g., steps 1 and 2 in task smurf detection) and are never displayed simultaneously in the same window as recited in claim 1. Rather, screen 40c replaces screen 40b in the window when the user completes step 1 of the task and move on to step 2. Therefore, at least because *Messinger* fails to show or suggest "receiving a command from a user to display the first work pane and the second work pane simultaneously; and displaying the first work pane and the second work pane in the window," independent claim 1 is not anticipated by *Messinger* under 35 U.S.C. §102(e).

Independent claim 8 recites features that are similar to those discussed above in connection with claim 1 and is, therefore, also not anticipated by *Messinger* for at least the reasons stated above. More specifically, claim 8 recites "displaying the first pane,

the second pane, and the third pane; receiving an input from the user to show the second pane as a related action; hiding the display of the second pane; and adding a link to the second user interface pattern to the one or more related actions.” The sequence of features recited in claim 8 indicate that all three panes are displayed in the same window prior to hiding of the second pane. Therefore, at least because *Messinger* does not show or suggest displayed more than one pane in the same window as discussed above, claim 8 is not anticipated by *Messinger*. Claims 9 and 16 are system claims that correspond to claims 1 and 8, respectively, and are also allowable over *Messinger* for the same reasons that claims 1 and 8 are allowable. Dependent claims 2-7 and 10-15 depend from claims 1 and 9, respectively, and are additionally allowable at least because of their dependency on allowable base claims.

In view of the above, Applicants submit that pending claims 1-16 are in condition for allowance and respectfully request prompt reconsideration by the Examiner.

Please grant any extensions of time required to enter this response and charge any additional required fees to our Deposit Account 06-0916.

Respectfully submitted,

FINNEGAN, HENDERSON, FARABOW,
GARRETT & DUNNER, L.L.P.

Dated: July 11, 2007

By: 

Cathy C. Ding
Reg. No. 52,820